UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,522	08/25/2003	Daniel C. Sigg	P-11031.00	2282
27581 MEDTRONIC,	7590 08/09/2007 INC.	•	EXAMINER	
710 MEDTRO	NIC PARKWAY NE		KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			· · ·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	08/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ک

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/647,522	SIGG ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Christopher D. Koharski	3763			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ma	ay 2007.				
2a) <u></u> ⊤	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
·—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
С	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositio	n of Claims					
4)⊠ C	4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.					
48	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9 and 18-41</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) 🗌 C	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
´ 6)⊠ C	Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10-17</u> is/are rejected.					
7) 🗌 C	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) <u> </u>	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicatio	n Papers					
9)□ T	he specification is objected to by the Examine	г.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
A	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)□ T	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)∏ A	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
<ol><li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li></ol>						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(		» 🗆	(DTO 442)			
· <u>—</u>	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) Informa	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

Examiner acknowledges the reply filed 5/16/2007 in which no claims were amended. Examiner acknowledges the 1.131 declaration antedating the Chee et al. (US20002/0183738) reference. Currently claims 1-41 are pending for examination, with claims 9 and 18-41 withdrawn from a previous election restriction.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haim et al. (6,309,370). Haim et al. discloses an intracardiac drug delivery catheter.

Regarding claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-13 and 15-17, Haim et al. discloses a catheter comprising a catheter body (20) that defines an inner lumen (26); a probe (24) with a needle tip within the inner lumen that delivers fluid (54) to a tissue site of a patient; and at least one electrode (36, 38) coupled to the catheter to detect contact between the catheter and the tissue site. The catheter body (20) is capable of guiding the probe (24) to a tissue site (Figure 5) with the probe being retractable and extendable (Figures 1A-1B) through a distal port (28) to deliver multiple therapeutic macromolecule compounds (col 18) (Figures 1-7).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Epstein et al. (6,835,193). Epstein et al. discloses an apparatus for controlled depth injections into body cavities.

Regarding claims 1-6, 8, 10, 12-13 and 15-17, Epstein et al. discloses a catheter comprising a catheter body (2) that defines an inner lumen (near 16); a probe (14) with a needle tip within the inner lumen that delivers fluid (from 400) to a tissue site of a patient; and at least one electrode (35) coupled to the catheter to detect contact

between the catheter and the tissue site. The catheter body (2) is capable of guiding the probe (14) to a tissue site with the probe being retractable and extendable (Figures 3-4) through a distal port (10) to deliver multiple therapeutic macromolecule compounds (cols 2 and 17) (Figures 1-6).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haim et al. (or Epstein et al.) in view of Mulier et al. (5,807,395). Haim et al. (or Epstein et al.) meets the claim limitations as described above except for the electrode used for cardiac pacing.

However, Mulier et al. teaches a apparatus for RF ablation.

Regarding claims 7, 11 and 14, Mulier et al. teaches a catheter (1) with a distal tip electrode (3) that is used for cardiac ablation and is disclosed as also being

employed for measurement functions or pacing of heart tissue by application of low energy electrical stimuli (Figure 1) (col 6, ln 20-55).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the teachings of Mulier to use the electrodes of Haim et al. (or Epstein et al.) for cardiac pacing in order to better treat the patient in conjunction with the active drug treatment. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Mulier et al. (cols 3-4).

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 10-17 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,522 Page 6

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 8 5 07

Christopher D. Koharski AU 3763

CUPTE LOCAL ANTENT EXAMANS

THE MILLERY GENTER 3700